



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ter was worthy of at least a brief discussion. One feature in the arrangement of the book has not appealed favorably to the reviewer. The Scripture references are removed from the text and are found only in the indexes in the beginning of the books; and the reference literature is found only on the last pages of each volume. Even here references are given not in particular, only in general. Chapter and verse on the margin of each page would not interrupt the flow of the story to those who have been so long accustomed to this feature. It would make it decidedly easier then to identify each section, and note what changes have been introduced. References to authorities placed at the bottom of the page would certainly add to the convenience of the reader.

Yet these are the non-essentials. The volumes are most worthy contributions to the present great need for scholarly constructive studies. They have already been used by the author as textbooks for Bible study. They will serve to hold many young men and women who are seeking a reasonable and connected story of the revelation of God through his early people. They will no doubt give a taste to some for further fruitful study along the more critical lines of biblical work. The volumes are thus to be heartily recommended. They present an adequate translation, illuminating historical notes, and a sane religious application.

I. G. MATTHEWS

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, CAN.

Our New Testament: How Did We Get It? By HENRY C. VEDDER.
Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1908. Pp.
xii+388. \$1.

The author sets out to show how the books now included in our New Testament attained their place in the canon, and how other Christian writings of the early age came to be rejected. After presenting all the material facts, as he thinks, he finds the following to have been the tests which determined canonicity: (1) the extent to which a book was commonly read in the churches; (2) the extent to which it was quoted by the early Fathers; (3) incidentally apostolic authorship was also considered, but this was certainly not a chief test; (4) correctness in doctrinal content; (5) the capacity of a book to edify its readers. This last was the primary and all-controlling test.

But what historical event, or events, furnished the incentive for applying tests? None in particular. The books gained prominence because they inherently contained a divine quality which Christendom recognized, at first silently and later openly. Ecclesiastical sanction exercised no control-

ling influence in the elevation of some books and in the rejection of others; the result was simply the expression of the general Christian consciousness. The author so reads the first four centuries of Christian history that it seems to him to establish beyond the shadow of a doubt the validity of his view. Others, however, with equal scholarship and with seemingly no stronger subjective bias, have read the history differently. The recent works of Gregory and Ferris (previously reviewed in the *Biblical World*) should be referred to by those who wish a further discussion of the questions.

The author's case, waiving for the moment his treatment of history, is perhaps weakest where he tries to make his theory account for the rejection of certain books which the early church valued highly. To imply, for example, that Paul was conscious of writing under the special influence of the Spirit while the non-canonical writers were not, is not fair to Clement of Rome at least, since he says he is distinctly conscious of the Spirit's guidance in writing to the Corinthians. Moreover, it is a fundamental thesis of the present treatise that the high estimate of the early Christian writings started with the recognition of a divine quality in them. This was not at first openly asserted but it was felt from the beginning, for the idea of the scriptural authority of Paul's epistles antedated the custom of reading them in public. The church never would have taken the trouble to preserve and publicly read writings not believed to be of divine origin. So it is maintained. Now it is a fact, which is not denied, that the early church took the trouble to preserve, read in public, and highly value the writings of Clement of Rome, Barnabas, and Hermas. If inspiration *ex hypothesi* underlay esteem, and if this, as has been claimed, was the ruling factor in determining canonicity, why were not these books canonized? At this point the hypothesis is not workable.

In matters of detail there are several minor defects. Ill-advised statements, such as that the Peshito belongs "not improbably" to the first half of the second century, occur too frequently. And the writer's manner is not always scientific. With naïve self-assurance he sets aside, from time to time, the work of such scholars as Westcott, Harnack, and Gregory, pronouncing his own work to be the statement of "all the material facts" and his inferences to be "rational," while others are charged with perverting facts and reasoning in a less than puerile fashion.

Notwithstanding these unfortunate features, the book has one merit that should be highly commended. It emphasizes that the canonical books claim our esteem not on the basis of any ecclesiastical authentication but because their contents appeal to our Christian consciousness.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE